| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 09/741,230 | 12/20/2000 | Dowell Allen, et. al. | 2000P09108 US |

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| BARQADLE, Yasin M. | |
| ART UNIT | PAGE NUMBER |
| 2153 | 5 |

Response To Official Action

## REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application. Original claims 4-9 are renumbered as claims 3-8 because numeral 3 was inadvertently omitted from the claims as originally filed. Consequently, the record should be amended to reflect that claims 1-8 are pending, as only eight claims were originally filed. These amendments are not made for reasons of patentability and are not narrowing. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is hereby requested in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

### 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by an article by John Zinky titled, "Visualizing Packet Traces," 1992 ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review, October 1992, pages 293-304. Hereinafter, this reference is referred to as "Zinky." Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. Claims which recite a single novel feature not disclosed in the cited reference are distinguishable over the reference, and thus patentable. As discussed below, Zinky fails to disclose at least one novel feature recited by each of these claims. Claim 1, recites in pertinent part:

> ... a CDL based trace decoding software tool that executes on an application server that is deployed within a distributed network for decoding data provided by any telecommunication network element,...;
>
> an encoder that creates and stores in a file system a plurality of executable CDL programs used to decode the trace data,...; [and]
>
> a plurality of client workstations connected to the distributed network wherein each of said workstations can access one or more application servers, each said application server having a CDL and signature based decoder engine that is capable of invoking one or more of said executable CDL programs to decode the trace data ...

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 09/741,230 | 12/20/2000 | Dowell Allen, et. al. | 2000P09108 US |

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| BARQADLE, Yasin M. | |
| ART UNIT | PAGE NUMBER |
| 2153 | 6 |

Response To Official Action

The Examiner is of the opinion that Zinky teaches these features. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. Specifically, the Examiner references Figures 2, 3, and 5 of Zinky for the proposition that these figures respectively show the features of claim 1. However, none of these figures, nor Zinky's corresponding description of them, disclose:

(i) a CDL-based trace decoding software tool for decoding data on any telecommunications network,

(ii) an encoder that creates and stores in a file system a plurality of executable CDL programs used to decode the trace data, or

(iii) a CDL-based and signature-based decoder engine that is capable of invoking one or more of the executable CDL programs to decode the trace data, as recited in claim 1.

In fact, neither the words "catalog definition language" nor the abbreviation "CDL" appear anywhere in the Zinky reference.

For example, the Examiner proposes that the software tap illustrated in Zinky's Figure 5 is the same as the claimed "CDL based decoding software tool that executes on any application server that is deployed within a distributed network." This does not appear to be correct, however. First, Zinky provides no indication whatsoever that the software tap is CDL-based. In fact, it would appear that there is no disclosure, whatsoever, that there is a decoding software tool for decoding data on any telecommunications network. Zinky only discusses, as shown in Figure 5 that a software tap resides between the OSI physical layer and the data link layer. The OSI system models the telecommunications process as a structure of seven layers. These layers address, in turn, the physical connection, the data link, network functions, transport and data flow, session management, presentation, and finally the application, as basic features of an end-to-end communication process. Zinky does not address having the ability to decode data on any telecommunications network.

As another example, the Examiner cites Zinky at page 295, paragraphs 9 -10 for the proposition that the phrase "transform/decode raw data into text" anticipates the claimed limitation of "... for decoding trace data provided by any telecommunication network element." This is incorrect. First, the cited section reads:

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 09/741,230 | 12/20/2000 | Dowell Allen, et. al. | 2000P09108 US |

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| BARQADLE, Yasin M. | |
| ART UNIT | PAGE NUMBER |
| 2153 | 7 |

Response To Official Action

> For a diagram to be generated, raw data is transformed through intermediate representations (Figure 3). At each stage, information is combined from several sources yielding a more precise representation. Users are an integral part of the refinement process. They direct the environment to build only the representations that are necessary. The environment helps the users by maintaining the intermediate results and offering a suite of transforms.
>
> This section contrasts familiar physical representations with more refined functional representations. Its aim is to illustrate the issues involved in transforming raw data into textbook diagrams...

Properly interpreting this section would include transforming raw data to a functional representation, i.e., textbook diagrams. But, the claimed invention does not transform "raw data into textbook diagrams" as taught by Zinky. Rather, claim 1 recites that the trace data is decoded using one or more of the CDL programs created and stored in a file by the encoder. Thus, the claimed element of "a CDL-based trace decoding software tool for decoding data on any telecommunications network" is also distinct from Zinky's disclosure.

Further regarding claim 1, the Examiner cites page 295, paragraphs 2-3 for the proposition that Zinky discloses "trace records are generated" and that such generation of trace records anticipates the claimed encoder. Applicants agree that Zinky discloses the formation of trace files, but disagree with the Examiner that these trace files anticipate the encoder recited in claim 1. Figure 2 of Zinky, for example, depicts two X.25 traces that were collected, one at a directly connected mainframe, and another at an entry gateway for a personal computer. But, nothing in Zinky discloses that either of these traces is CDL-based, or that an encoder creates and stores in a file system a plurality of executable CDL programs used to decode the trace data.

For the above reasons, claim 1 is distinguishable over Zinky. Claims 2-3 and 7-8 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for the same above reasons, as well as for their added features. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of claims 1-3, 5 and 7-8 be withdrawn, and these claims passed to issue.

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 09/741,230 | 12/20/2000 | Dowell Allen, et. al. | 2000P09108 US |

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| BARQADLE, Yasin M. | |
| ART UNIT | PAGE NUMBER |
| 2153 | 8 |

Response To Official Action

**35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections**

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Zinky in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,643,683 to Drumm, *et. al.* ("Drumm"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In order to reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the MPEP mandates that three basic criteria must be met to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness:

> *First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference themselves or in knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations.*

Applicants submit that the references, either singly or when combined, fail to teach or suggest all the claimed features. Hence, there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness demonstrated.

*Independent Claim 9*

First, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's statement on page 6 of the Office Action that, "Zinky shows substantial features of the claimed invention." Zinky and Drumm do not show the features of independent claim 9 (now claim 8) such as, for example,

> an .. application containing one or more Catalog Definition Language (CDL) catalogs, each said protocol being defined by one or more CDL catalogs;
>
> an iTAS relational database... used to store said catalogs and provide said iTAS application with configuration parameters and administrative services;
>
> ...
>
> wherein said iTAS application has a CDL based decoder engine, said decoder engine being reentrant and wherein said iTAS application is deployed using distributed computing technology and using a client/server architecture.

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 09/741,230 | 12/20/2000 | Dowell Allen, et. al. | 2000P09108 US |

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| BARQADLE, Yasin M. | |
| ART UNIT | PAGE NUMBER |
| 2153 | 9 |

Response To Official Action

As discussed above, Zinky discloses placing a software tap between protocol layers of a telecommunications network, retrieving trace data from the software tap, and converting the raw trace data to textbook diagrams. Zinky never address CDL, for example.

Drumm, on the other hand, discloses an interactive request server program that interfaces a plurality of client computers with a timing analysis program for electronic circuits. This timing analysis program is a tool used to calculate expected delays along signal paths in a circuit design to assist in identifying problems. Drumm teaches that for implementing timing analysis interactive client-server based timing analysis, for example, a timing server computer uses a timing analysis engine (or program) and an application server program, resident in a memory of the computer, as well as a logic model and stored timing data, which are resident in a Direct Access Storage Device. In use, the interactive request server program receives client requests from a plurality of client computers over a network. In response to each client request, the interactive request server program accesses the timing analysis program to retrieve timing data based upon such client request and forwards the timing data to the client computer that made the request.

As to col. 2, lines 43-65, this passage merely recites that the interactive request server program receives client requests from the plurality of client computers over a network, and, in response to each client request, accesses the timing analysis program to retrieve timing data based upon such client request and thereafter forwards the timing data to the client computer making such request. By using the interactive request server program as an interface to the timing analysis program, interactive timing analysis, and if desired, collaborative timing analysis, may be performed on a logic model by multiple clients or users, and often with less computer resources than would otherwise be required.

What is evidently missing from Zinky and Drumm is:

(i) a CDL based decoder engine that is reentrant; or

(ii) an (iTAS) application containing one or more Catalog Definition Language (CDL) catalogs ....

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 09/741,230 | 12/20/2000 | Dowell Allen, et. al. | 2000P09108 US |

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| BARQADLE, Yasin M. | |
| ART UNIT | PAGE NUMBER |
| 2153 | 10 |

Response To Official Action

*Claims 4 and 6*

As to claim 4, the Examiner cites Drumm at col. 4, lines 53-61. However, this passage does not show the features of claim 4. For example, col. 4, lines 53-61 discloses:

> Each computer 12, 14, 16 operates under the control of an operating system, and executes or otherwise relies upon various computer software applications, components, programs, objects, modules, data structures, etc. For implementing interactive client-server based timing analysis, for example, timing server computer 14 utilizes a timing analysis engine (or program) 54 and application server program 56, shown resident in memory 32, as well as a logic model 58 and stored timing data 60, shown resident in DASD 50.

As further discussed in cols. 5-9, the timing analysis program is configured to generate timing data for a logic model representative of a circuit design. An interactive request server program is interfaced with the timing analysis program and configured to receive client requests from a plurality of client computers over a network to access the timing data for the logic model. In response to each client request, the timing analysis program is accessed to retrieve timing data based upon such client request and thereafter forward the timing data to the client computer making such request.

However, it is clearly seen that this timing analysis program is not used for concurrent access to a decoding service, as recited in the claimed invention. In contrast, claim 4 recites that each of the plurality of client workstations can have concurrent access to the decoding services provided by a single application server. In the claimed invention, the concurrent access is accomplished by reentrant code in the executable CDL programs. This simply is not accomplished by the Drumm reference.

Additionally, claims 4 and 6 are dependent claims, depending from a distinguishable independent claim. By virtue of these dependencies, claims 4-6 are also distinguishable and in condition for allowance.

Applicants submit that the Examiner has thus failed to prove a *prima facie* case of obviousness and that the rejection of claims 4, 6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should now be withdrawn.

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 09/741,230 | 12/20/2000 | Dowell Allen, et. al. | 2000P09108 US |

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| BARQADLE, Yasin M. | |
| ART UNIT | PAGE NUMBER |
| 2153 | 11 |

Response To Official Action

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that all of the claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below, if needed. Applicants hereby make a written petition for extension of time if needed. Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian K. Johnson, Reg. No. 46,808
Attorney for Applicant(s)
phone +1-732-321-3017
fax +1-732-590-6411
email brian.johnson@siemens.com

PLEASE DIRECT ALL WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE TO:
Siemens Corporation
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830